



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,859	08/23/2001	Masahiko Enari	09812.0651	9497

22852 7590 07/29/2008  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
----------

REFAI, RAMSEY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/29/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/935,859	ENARI, MASAHIKO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ramsey Refai	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Responsive to Amendment filed May 7, 2008. Claims 6-13 remain pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, the Applicant argues with substance:

Argument A: *the limitation “enabling the customer to view **physical** commodities...at the store terminal” is supported by the Applicant's specification and requests withdrawal of the 112, first rejections.*

In the remarks, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Applicant has cited various citations of alleged support; however none of the cited portions are in the context of a method for providing electronic content to a customer using a remote user terminal and a store terminal via a first and second communication channel as claimed. The alleged support include citations from different embodiments, including online shopping, retrieval of goods via a vending machine, and opening a menu screen to view car related services. None of the cited portions appear to be related to a method for providing electronic content to a customer using a remote user terminal and a store terminal via a first and second communication channel. The rejection is maintained.

Argument B: *Rautila does not teach the identification code corresponds only to the electronic content item.*

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. After the user selects a particular digital product desired from among the titles available on the electronic shop server (column 6, lines 1-8), the user receives a unique order number, which corresponds to the

selected digital product (column 9, lines 60-63, column 6, lines 1-8 and 35-38). The unique order number is used to obtain the desired digital product from the electronic shop server which meets the limitation of “an identification code corresponds only to the electronic content item”. Therefore Rautila meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 6 and 10 include the feature “*enabling the customer to view physical commodities...at the store terminal*” which appears to lack proper support in the disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rautila (US Patent No. 6,714,797).

6. As per claim 6, Rautila teach a method for providing electronic content to a customer using a remote user terminal and a store information terminal, the method comprising the steps of:

accessing a menu including a plurality of electronic content items available for purchase using the remote user terminal (**column 6, lines 2-7**);

selecting an electronic content item using the remote user terminal (**column 6, lines 5-7**);

obtaining an identification code, via a first communication channel (**column 6, line 1; internet 150**), for individually identifying the retrieved electronic content item (**column 6, line 35-40, column 8, lines 31-37**); wherein the identification code corresponds to the electronic content item (**column 9, lines 60-63, column 6, lines 1-8 and 35-38**);

inputting the identification code at the store information terminal (**column 6, lines 50-53**);

enabling the customer to purchase (**column 6, lines 53-64**), via a second communication channel, the second communication channel being different from the first communication channel (**hotspot network 50**), the retrieved electronic content item corresponding to the identification code (**column 6, lines 50-64**); and

enabling the customer to download the electronic content item (**column 6, line 53-column 7, line 5**); and

enabling the customer to view *commodities* or services that are available for purchase **(column 6, lines 2-7)** in addition to the electronic content items at the store information terminal **(column 5, lines 45-60)**.

Although Rautila teaches that a hotspot network location can be in a shopping mall, department store, video store, etc **(column 4, lines 64-67)** and that advertisements are transmitted to the mobile device to solicit further purchases **(column 6, lines 64-67)**, Rautila fails to teach enabling the customer to view *physical commodities* in addition to the electronic content item that are available for purchase. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit advertisements to the mobile device for physical products available at the hotspot location (i.e. available at the shopping mall or store) in order to promote sales.

7. As per claim 7, Rautila teaches downloading the electronic content item to a portable recording medium **(column 4, lines 15-25; downloading content to mobile station 10)**.

8. As per claim 8, Rautila teaches wherein the menu including the plurality of electronic content items available for purchase is located on a server accessible by the remote user terminal via a network **(column 6, lines 2-8)**.

9. As per claim 9, Rautila teaches wherein the step of obtaining the identification code comprises downloading the identification code to a portable recording medium **(column 6, lines 35-38; unique order number downloaded to mobile station 10)**.

10. As per claims 10-13, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 6-9 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571)272-3975. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramsey Refai  
July 23, 2008  
/R. R./  
Unit 3627

/F. Ryan Zeender/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627